1	Case: Utah Chapter of the Sierra Club vs Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
2	Docket No.: 2009-019 Cause No. C/025/0005 Reporter: Tamera Stephens, Q&A Reporting, Inc.
3	1872 South Main, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115
4	WITNESS CERTIFICATE
5 1	State of Utah )
6	ss. County of Salt Lake )
7	I, JODY PATTERSON, HEREBY DECLARE: That I am the
8	witness referred to in the foregoing testimony; that I have read the transcript and know the contents thereof; that with
9	these corrections I have noted this transcript truly and accurately reflects my testimony.
10	PAGE-LINE CHANGE/CORRECTION REASON
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	No corrections were made.
21	-1, 17 17 ···
22	JODY PATTERSON
23	SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to at Avance
24	March, this 22 day of March, 2010.
25	DULTUS POLICION NOTATY Public
۷. ک	BRITTNEY BOHANNON Notary Public Notary Public State of Utah
	My Commission Expires September 24, 2011 4 N Main, Moab, UT 84532

.1	prepared by Montgomery Archeological Consultants?
2	A. Not to my knowledge.
3	Q. With what personnel at Montgomery Archeological
4	Consultants did ACD deal in the preparation of this plan?
5	A. Mainly Jody Patterson and Patricia Stavish.
6	MR. MORRIS: Thank you, sir. I would like to
7	question Mr. Patterson, then. Thank you for your testimony.
8	JODY PATTERSON,
9	being first placed under oath, was examined and testified as
LO	follows:
11	EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. MORRIS:
13	Q. Would you state your name for the record.
14	A. Jody Patterson.
L5	Q. How are you employed, Mr. Patterson?
16	A. I work for Montgomery Archeological Consultants as
17	a principal investigator.
18	Q. Mr. Patterson, I am Walton Morris. I am one of
19	the lawyers for the Utah Chapter of the Sierra Club and the
20	other petitioners in this proceeding before the Board of
21	Oil, Gas and Mining concerning the approval of the Coal
22	Hollow mining permit that Alton Coal Development, LLC,
23	obtained back last October.
24	A. Uh-huh (affirmative).

Have you ever been deposed before?

25

Q.

- Q. The process of deposition is one in which I as the attorney for the petitioners question you as a representative of Alton Coal Development. Do you understand that you appear here by reason of Alton Coal Development's designation of you as the witness to speak for Alton Coal Development on these cultural and historic resource issues?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You understand that the testimony you give will be the testimony of Alton Coal Development as well as your own personal testimony?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. If at any time during the deposition I ask a question that you don't fully understand or would like for me to rephrase in another way, let me know that, and I will try to be as clear as I possibly can.

If you need to take a break during any time in the deposition, I want you to feel free to ask to take a break, and I will most certainly try to accommodate you in a situation like that.

How long have you been employed by Montgomery Archeological Consultants?

- A. I began working for Montgomery's in spring/summer of 2001.
  - Q. Please describe the nature of the work that

Montgomery Archeological Consultants did in connection with the Coal Hollow permit application.

A. We did several things. Our initial work on Alton Coal was to provide a Class 1 literature review of all the previous inventories that had taken place in and around the area.

We also did a small survey of some drill hole locations that they needed for testing, I believe, coal, depth and everything. I'm not sure exactly what the drill holes were for, but we surveyed in an area around those to make sure there were no cultural resources.

Then we did the cultural resource inventory of the area that would be considered private coal, private surface. And we also completed a cultural resource inventory of the greater lease area that incorporates, you know, the boundaries that are shown on most of the maps.

And then we participated in writing the cultural resource management plan in conjunction with Alton Coal and various agencies, including the BLM Division of Oil, Gas and Mining, PLPCO and SHPO.

- Q. Was there also a data recovery plan?
- A. Yes, there was a data recovery plan, too.
- Q. Did Montgomery Archeological Consultants play a role in developing the data recovery plan?
  - A. Yes, sir.

I will ask the court reporter to mark MR. MORRIS: 1 this as Exhibit-1. 2 3 (Exhibit-1 was marked.) MR. MORRIS: And I will say to counsel that for 4 these cultural and resource questions, I do not have extra 5 copies of the exhibits, so we will pass them around as need 6 be and then copy them else-wise. 7 MS. DRAGOO: That's fine. 8 Ask you to take a look at Exhibit-1. 9 Q. A. Uh-huh (affirmative). 10 You described two distinct geographic areas, I 11 0. think, in terms of what Montgomery Archeological Consultants 12 13 did, their focuses. Uh-huh (affirmative). 14 A. Do you recognize, first of all, this map? 15 0. Yes, sir. 16 Α. 17 Q. What is the map for the record? More or less. A. 18 Pardon? 19 What is the map? 20 Q. The map shows in blue the proposed BLM lease 21 Α. areas, and another area that's pink that has private 22 surface, private coal, and private surface, federal coal. 23 All right. Were those the two areas that you 24 Q.

25

referred to earlier in describing the different focuses?

No, sir, they are not. 1 A. They are not. 2 0. Are they related to those areas at all? 3 The first cultural resource survey that we did was Α. 4 for the private surface, private coal. 5 That would be the pink area shown on the map? Q. 6 Except for this T-shaped area shown on this map. 7 Α. This was what our original survey for Alton Coal was. 8 9 For the record, the "T" that you referred to 0. appears to be in the northern portion of the area shaded in 10 pink? 11 It's that area in Section 19 and Section Α. Yeah. 12 30. 13 Okay. 14 Q. And designated by this dotted blue line. 15 All right. And how about the blue area? Is that 16 0. an accurate depiction of the entire -- the blue and the pink 17 areas together -- do the blue and the pink areas together 18 correctly depict the entire area of your firm's focus? 19 For the most part, I would have to say yes. 20 Without looking at our cultural resource survey management 21 report, I could not verify those boundaries by memory. 22 MS. DRAGOO: Could you clarify what you meant by 23 "focus"? 24

Well, he described a different focus

MR. MORRIS:

for one part of the work than for another geographically, 1 and that's what I am trying to get on the record, just 2 3 whether this map depicts those two separate areas of focus. MS. DRAGOO: And in terms of "focus," you mean 4 inventory? 5 MR. MORRIS: Yes. 6 MS. DRAGOO: Okay. Thank you. 7 Did you understand that "focus" meant "inventory"? 8 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. 9 Now, I can say that actually I know this map does 10 A. not accurately reflect one of those reports because one of 11 the reports that we did that covered a lot of the lease 1.2 areas actually covered a bigger area than what is shown on 13 this map. And this was actually -- the boundaries were 14 changed. 15 So we actually have areas that are in our cultural 16 17 resource Class 3 inventory report that is larger than this. All right. 0. 18 And the reason I know that is because the Alton 19 Α. Cemetery is not included in that boundary, and when we did 20 our survey, it was. 21 All right. Anything else that you note that is 22 Q. not shaded either blue or pink that was within the scope of 23 your surveys? 24

Not that I can recall.

Α.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- All right. Were there any other documents that Q. Montgomery Archeological Consultants submitted in support of the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining's review of the Coal Hollow permit application, besides the ones -- the three that you discussed, I believe the cultural resource inventory, cultural resource management plan, and data recovery plan?
- I think those are the -- the cultural resource Α. management inventories, which there were several of, the data recovery plan, and the cultural resource management plan, that is what has been done to date to my knowledge.
- Please describe the purpose of the cultural Q. resource inventory.
- The cultural resource inventories at the Class 3 Α. level or the Class 1 level, sir?
  - Let's start with the Class 1 level. 0.
- Α. Okay. They call them cultural resource inventories, they call them Class 1s. Those are literally the literature reviews where we go into the state records, the BLM records, and identify all of the previous inventories and previous archeological and historic resources that are known to be within a general area, and we basically produce a report that details those findings and submit that.

It's usually used as a guiding document in

determining how much more additional inventory and at what 1 level is required. 2 All right. And did you say Level 3? 3 Q. Level 3. Α. Q. Is there a Level 2? 5 There is a Level 2. Level 2 inventory is a A. sampling inventory where specific areas within a larger 7 project area are selected and surveyed for cultural 8 9 resources. Did you do a Level 2? Q. 10 Level 2 is not required on this. 11 A. Okay. So you did a Level 1. 12 Q. Uh-huh (affirmative). 13 Α. And then a Level 3. Would you describe a Level 3. Q. 14 Level 3 is an intensive survey of an entire 15 Α. project area or undertaking as defined be the proponent when 16 17 we get it. Does ACD agree that the purpose of the cultural 18 resource inventory is the identification of properties that 19 may be eligible for the National Register of Historic 20 Places? 21 22 Α. Yes. Does ACD agree that the cultural resource 23 Q. inventory does not evaluate and address the impacts of the 24

Coal Hollow Mine on any historic property?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 5
- 6 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 1.1
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

- Can you say that again, please. Α.
- Does ACD agree that the cultural resource 0. inventory for the Coal Hollow Mine does not evaluate and address the impacts of the mine on any historic property?
- In my understanding, I would disagree with that Α. statement because the cultural resource inventory serves as the basis for making those determinations.
- I don't understand your distinction, so let me ask you to explain for the record, please.
- In a cultural resource management -- or in a cultural resource inventory report, there is an idea of the undertaking and those effects to sites have recommendations made as to whether they should be avoided, if they do not need to be avoided, or if they need to be mitigated in some way.

What agencies do with that information is above and beyond what Alton Coal can do, but those recommendations are made based on the archeologists who are on the field and their findings.

- In this instance, however, did the cultural resource inventory address any historic property? Any property on or eligible for the listing on the National Register of Historic Places?
  - I am kind of confused. Α. I'm sorry.
    - The purpose of the cultural resource inventory is

to identify those properties.

.13

- Q. And did it identify properties?
- A. Oh, yes. Absolutely.
- Q. I see. How many?
- A. I don't remember the exact number, but off the top of my head, overall within the area shown on this map and both projects, there are between 60 and 70 sites, if I recall correctly.
- Q. Okay. And with respect, now, again, to the Coal Hollow permit application to the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining, did your firm identify all 60 with respect to those, to that project?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Did there come a time when your firm designated the entire -- or subdivided the entire geographic scope of its work into Phase 1 and Phase 2?
- A. We conducted our surveys based on what the proponent gave us and said that they needed to have looked at, so that was not done by us. If you are talking about when we did this survey versus when we did the big BLM portion of the survey.
- Q. Let me rephrase my question, then. Did there come a time when Alton Coal Development or the division designated or subdivided the area, the geographical area of your inquiry into Phase 1 and Phase 2?

undertakings.

- A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
- Q. What was the undertaking, or what were the undertakings, if there were more than one, involved in the work that Montgomery did in this instance?
- A. The undertaking that was given to us originally was that Alton wanted to develop an open-pit coal mine, and within the first area they gave us, they kind of delineated where that pit was going to be and where some of the auxiliary facilities were going to be as well.
- Q. Is the area that Alton Coal identified to you depicted on Exhibit-1?
  - A. More or less, yes, sir.
- Q. And would you describe for the record how it is depicted. How does one determine that --
- A. The original area that we inventoried that they said was of greatest concern, where the open pit and a lot of facilities were going to be are defined on this map as the pink that would be private surface, private coal.
- Q. Insofar as you know, just for the record, that was never designated as Phase 1 for you or for your company?
- A. In conversations we have had with Alton Coal, it was -- this was identified as what they wanted to get

started on, and then if they got the BLM leases, they would move on to other areas. So, yes, there was a phased approach, but we were never -- you know, "Come do Phase 1, come do Phase 2." It was always presented in those terms to the best of my knowledge.

- Q. But as a practical matter, there was a Phase 1, and that is what is shown in pink, more or less, I think you said.
  - A. More or less except for the T.
- Q. Except for the T. And a Phase 2, which would be the area shown in blue plus the Alton Cemetery?
  - A. Yeah.

- Q. Did Montgomery Archeological Consultants provide

  ACD with any analysis of effects on historic properties

  located completely outside the area identified in pink on

  Figure 2 --
  - A. We would not know --
- Q. -- on Exhibit-1.
- A. Pardon?
- 20 Q. I'm sorry. Identified in pink on Exhibit-1.
- 21 A. Anywhere in the pink?
  - Q. No. Anywhere outside of the pink.
  - A. Of course, we conducted the inventories in the blue areas as well, but, to my knowledge, we haven't really addressed any impacts to those sites yet because we don't

- Q. Right. So, again, my question was, did Montgomery Archeological Consultants provide ACD with any analysis of the effects of the mine on historic properties that are located completely outside of the area shown in pink on Exhibit-1?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Which?
- A. There was one site that straddled that boundary which impacts were considered on, as well as some other cultural resources that were along the edge of that area, this pink and blue border, that also straddled those legal designated lines that we suggested that they avoid.
- Q. All right. But were there -- were any of the areas you just referred to in your last answer completely outside of the pink area?
  - A. No, sir.
  - Q. Thank you.
- Does ACD agree that the cultural resources inventory was prepared to address the division's approval of the Coal Hollow Mine application?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Does ACD agree that the cultural resources

To the best of my knowledge, that has not been

- Q. In addition to the cultural resource inventory, Montgomery Archeological Consultants prepared a cultural resource management plan for Alton Coal Development's proposed development of the Alton Amphitheater in Sink Valley; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Are you familiar with the cultural resources management plan prepared for the Coal Hollow Mine permit?
  - A. Yes, sir.
    - Q. Is it dated May 23, 2008?
- A. The second draft, working draft, is dated that, yes.
  - Q. Was that the final draft?
  - A. There is no final draft yet. It is still in the second draft. It is a living document. Or it is being considered as such. So additions will be made to it if the LBI stuff is added into it. Once that's finalized.
  - Q. Was the May 23, 2008, cultural resources management plan final as -- or with respect to the Alton Coal Development application for mining on private lands?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. There were no changes made to it after May 23, 2008, prior to the permit approval on October 15th of 2009?
    - A. No changes.

Q.

Was it, in fact, limited -- so limited?

- A. Yes. If this -- yes.
- Q. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. DRAGOO: Can we just identify the document for the record.

- Q. Please.
- A. Do you want me --
- Q. Would you, please.
- A. This is the concurrence letter that -- it looks like Oil, Gas and Mining sent to the SHPO for concurrence on the archeological sites identified in our initial survey report.
  - Q. Would you state the date of the letter.
  - A. July 10, 2008.
- Q. And the author of the letter. Or, I'm sorry, the person to whom the letter was sent.
- A. Martin Wilson, who is the State Historic Preservation officer.
  - O. And the author of the letter.
  - A. Daron Haddock.
    - Q. All right, sir. Thank you.
- Did Montgomery Archeological Consultants look at the lease by application area in preparing documentation to support the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining's determination of eligibility and effect?
- A. I'm not sure if that went through the Division of

Oil, Gas and Mining or if that went through the BLM. 1 Or both? 2 It probably would go through both, but I'm not 3 sure who -- I cannot recall right off the top of my head who 4 was the lead agency on that, because I know that we sent 5 that information to the BLM as well. But I would assume 6 that it would be submitted -- yeah -- memory is coming back. 7 It's been a while. Yes, it went to both. 9 It went to both? Q. 10 Yes. 11 A. Thank you, sir. Q. 1.2 Did Montgomery Archeological Consultants look at 13 the lease by application area in preparing the data recovery 14 plan? 15 Α. No. 16 Are you familiar with the permit area identified 17 0. in ACD's Coal Hollow Mine permit application? 18 The general area. Not the exact boundaries. Α. 19 You are familiar with the general area, did you Q. 20 21 say? Basically what's shown on the map. 22 Α. Shown in pink? 23 Q. Yeah. A. 24 Just so that I am clear and you are certain of 25 Q.

A. Uh-huh (affirmative).

- Q. And you responded that the permit area was, to your knowledge, the area shown in pink; is that correct?
- A. A little clarification. When I look at this map, what I see is actually the work that we have done and the project areas that are defined by the work that we did and not necessarily what Alton Coal has proposed. So this area in pink minus this area in T, I see as one area. The rest of it, including this pink T, I see as a second area. And that correlates to what our cultural resource inventories covered.
- Q. So your understanding of the permit area is the area shown in pink on Exhibit-1 less the T at the north end of that pink area?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. All right. Referring to that in my subsequent questions as the permit area, and recognizing that you are doing the very best you can with the exhibit there, did Montgomery Archeological Consultants make an evaluation of the effect of the Coal Hollow Mine as proposed in the permit application to the division on any historic resources that are completely outside the permit area?

cultural and historic resources analysis for the Coal Hollow

- A. Yes. And in those regards, in the cultural resource management plan, SHPO specifically asked that we include the Panguitch Historical District in there, but because that district was being analyzed as the cumulative effects of the EIS that was being proposed, that we did not need to reinvent the wheel and put that analysis into the CRMP. It was just noted in the CRMP that this is something that needs to be considered but kind of defers to the EIS, which was still collecting data and doing analysis at that time.
- Q. So if I understand your testimony correctly, and please correct me if I'm wrong, there was no actual consideration of the effect of the mine on the Panguitch Historical -- National Historical District in connection with the work done prior to the approval of the Coal Hollow permit application?
- A. It was being analyzed under the EIS, which was done before the permit.
- Q. Was any information on that submitted to the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining?
  - A. Not to my knowledge.
- Q. Did the State Historic Preservation Office ask or recommend consideration of effects on the Panguitch National

1	Historic District in connection with the approval of the
2	Coal Hollow Mine?
3	A. They did not ask me. I'm not sure if you would
4	have to talk to SHPO to know what they were requesting
5	because I really don't know.
6	Q. But they made no request to you?
7	A. Not for analysis or anything, no.
8	MR. MORRIS: That's all the questions I have.
9	Thank you very much for your testimony.
10	THE WITNESS: Thank you. I'm sorry, your
11	questions were kind of hard to follow.
12	MR. MORRIS: You did a very good job.
13	EXAMINATION
14	BY MS. DRAGOO:
15	Q. I just had one follow-up question just to clarify.
16	You testified, referring to Exhibit-1, that the
17	permit area excluded the T area? Is that your
18	understanding? In pink.
19	A. If I were to go back to my documents, yeah, our
20	understanding would have been it would have been just
21	private surface, private coal, and that was the first area
22	we looked at.
23	Q. And was that first area that you looked at, which
24	I think you referred to as Phase 1; is that correct?
25	A. There seems to be confusion in phases and whatnot.

I don't think that we necessary went to try and synchronize the cultural resource inventories that we have done with necessarily with phases because they may not be right in sync with each other. And that goes with the CRMP.

Two, is that our phases that we talk about in dealing with mitigation and determination of effect and all of that sort of thing may not necessarily be in sync with the phases in the permit.

The CRMP and other things are kind of off in their own little world, and the archeologists like to kind of cluster around things. And so there can always be confusion.

My understanding is that this was mostly the permit area generally that was going --

- Q. When you say "this," you are referring to the entire pink area; is that correct?
  - A. I'm mostly thinking private surface, private coal.
- Q. Okay. Just one follow-up question. Did you conduct a cultural resources inventory of the private surface and federal coal?
- A. This pink area designated in this little sideways

  T? Yes, that was done with -- at the same time that the

  majority of the blue area on this map was surveyed.

MS. DRAGOO: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR. MORRIS: Any questions by anyone else for this

1	witness?
2	MR. ALDER: I didn't think I was allowed.
3	MR. MORRIS: Thank you. Let's go off the record
4	and take a break.
5	(Break was taken from 10:31 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.)
6	ERIK CARL PETERSEN,
7	being first placed under oath, was examined and testified as
8	follows:
9	EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. MORRIS:
11	Q. Would you state your full name for the record,
12	please.
13	A. My name is Erik Carl Petersen.
14	Q. Where do you live, Mr. Petersen?
15	A. I live in Lehi, Utah.
16	Q. How are you employed?
17	A. I am the principal of Petersen Hydrologic, LLC.
18	We are consultants in hydrogeology.
19	Q. How long have you been so employed?
20	A. July of 2000 is when I started that enterprise.
21	Q. Would you state for the record your educational
22	background.
23	A. I have a bachelor's degree in geology from Brigham
24	Young University. I am a licensed professional geologist in
25	the state of Utah. And I have a master's degree in